

**ROBERT J. TRULASKE, SR. COLLEGE OF BUSINESS
UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI**

Guidelines for Annual Performance Evaluation of Faculty

(Revised February 14, 1996; August 25, 2006; and January 29, 2010)

The purpose of these policies and procedures is to encourage planned progress by individual faculty members toward University (MU), Trulaske College of Business (TCoB), and academic unit (department and school) goals. This purpose requires that criteria for assessing performance be set in advance, be as specific as possible, be known to the persons to whom they apply, and be uniformly and equitably applied. These policies and procedures recognize that the primary responsibilities of all faculty members include teaching, research, and service, and that all faculty members are expected to be good organizational citizens. Tenured and tenure-track members of the TCoB faculty are covered by these policies and procedures. Except as identified below, the guidelines are not intended to supersede either the TCoB Teaching Evaluation Policies (TEP) as approved by the faculty on November 20, 1992 or the TCoB Guidelines for Promotion and Tenure as approved by the faculty on May 5, 1995.

A. POLICY FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE

I. FACTORS IN ASSESSING PERFORMANCE

1. Teaching and Student-Related Activities. Teaching is a priority in the TCoB. Learning (results) is more important than process (approach). As such, faculty members are expected to place a high value on teaching and student-related activities, and to continuously strive to improve student learning. Pertinent activities include the following:

a. *Activities related to classroom instruction:*

- (1) Use of effective teaching methods, including interactive methods (when appropriate);
- (2) Application of fair and reliable means of measuring/evaluating student learning;
- (3) Development of helpful course materials (e.g., cases, syllabi);
- (4) Demonstration of current knowledge and understanding of relevant subject matter;
- (5) Continuous efforts to improve instructional methods and approaches;
- (6) Availability and willingness to counsel/advise students outside of class;
- (7) Consideration of the number, level, and size of classes; and
- (8) Classroom related activities not otherwise mentioned.

b. *Other teaching and student-related activities:*

- (1) Direction of independent student studies or research, including serving on doctoral committees;
- (2) Publication of textbooks and other instructional materials;
- (3) Teaching in executive development or extension programs;
- (4) Development of new courses, including honors and writing intensive courses;
- (5) Participation in conferences and workshops aimed at improving teaching; and

(6) Teaching related activities not otherwise mentioned.

The quality and effectiveness of a faculty member's teaching performance shall be evaluated in accordance with the College TEP document. These policies require, as a minimum, that teaching performance be evaluated on the basis of both student evaluations (as mandated by the University) and peer evaluations (to be conducted by a faculty member's own department/school teaching evaluation committee). Faculty members and unit heads are responsible for providing this information as described in the College TEP document. The specific focus of these evaluations and other information or criteria related to the evaluation of a faculty member's teaching performance is governed by each academic unit's statement of teaching evaluation policies (as provided in the TEP document).

2. Research and Scholarly Activities. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the growth of knowledge in their fields. In assessing research and scholarly activities, special attention will be given to the quality and contribution of the research. Factors used to assess a faculty member's research productivity and activity shall include:

- a. Papers published in or accepted for publication in refereed journals, including the perceived quality of the journals;
- b. Publication of scholarly books;
- c. Papers published in or accepted for publication in non-refereed journals;
- d. Acquisition of research grants and research contracts for MU;
- e. Papers accepted for publication in research proceedings;
- f. Presentations given at professional meetings or research workshops; and
- g. Other research and scholarly activities not otherwise mentioned.

3. Professional Service Contributions. Faculty members are expected to contribute to the service needs of the academic and professional communities, and they are expected to exhibit strong citizenship within and outside the MU academic community. Accordingly, factors used to assess a faculty member's professional service contributions shall include:

- a. *Internal service contributions*, including service to the faculty member's department/school, to the TCoB and to MU, which shall be evidenced by participation in:
 - (1) Committee activities;
 - (2) Student organizations and activities;
 - (3) Program development of the faculty member's department/school, TCoB, and MU (e.g., developing academic programs, facilitating program accreditation);
 - (4) Special projects (e.g., participating in student recruiting, program coordination and symposium development); and
 - (5) Leadership roles that do not include administrative positions (e.g., being a committee chair, initiating new student activities).
- b. *External service contributions* shall be evidenced by the faculty member's:
 - (1) Participation in professional organizations (e.g., serving as an officer, a confer-

- ence track chair, a director or a committee member);
- (2) Serving the profession as an editor, associate editor, editorial board member or manuscript reviewer;
 - (3) Facilitating the growth and development of the Missouri business and government community (e.g., serving on a business or a government commission, giving a presentation to a civic organization);
 - (4) Generating soft monies for a department/school or TCoB; and
 - (5) Consulting activities.
- c. *Organizational citizenship*, including activities by a faculty member for the betterment of MU and the TCoB, which shall be evidenced by the faculty member's:
- (1) Collegiality within MU and the TCoB (e.g., supporting colleagues, attending faculty meetings);
 - (2) Flexibility and versatility in teaching and scheduling assignments;
 - (3) Enhancing the reputation of the TCoB or MU in the community; and
 - (4) Upholding and practicing accepted ethical standards.
- d. *Administrative contributions*, which shall be evidenced by a faculty member assuming an administrative position within the TCoB.
- e. Other professional service or organizational citizenship activities not otherwise mentioned.

II. ALTERNATIVE PERFORMANCE MODELS

1. The Models. Given that MU has a major commitment to teaching, research and service, both the College as a whole and individual academic units are expected to maintain a balance of performance among teaching (40%), research (40%) and service (20%). For the College, oversight responsibility for maintaining such a balance of performance shall lie with the Dean, and for the individual academic units this responsibility shall lie with the unit head of each academic unit. Within the 40-40-20 balance, individual faculty performance may be allowed to vary. Performance options from which faculty may choose, with the approval of the unit head, include the following:

<i>Faculty Performance Models</i>	Averages for the Models	<i>Model Components</i>			Percent Total
		Percent Teaching	Percent Research	Percent Service	
BALANCED	40-40-20	35-45	35-45	15-25	100
TEACHING	55-25-20	50-60	20-30	15-25	100
RESEARCH	25-55-20	20-30	50-60	15-25	100
ADMINISTRATION	20-20-60	15-25	15-25	55-65	100

2. Illustrations of the Models. Normally, a 10 percent teaching value would mean teaching one three credit hour course for one semester. Although less definitive, a 10 percent increase in the research value typically would mean that the teaching load would be reduced by a one three credit hour course for a semester and the expected research productivity would be increased to above average. To illustrate each of the models' percentages, consider the following examples:

- a. *Under a 40-40-20 model*, the faculty member typically would teach four three credit hour courses (sections) per year, and generate an average level of research and service productivity over the year;
- b. *Under a 60-20-20 model*, the faculty member typically would teach six three credit hour courses (sections) per year, generate a less than average level of research productivity, and perform an average level of service over the year; and
- c. *Under a 20-60-20 model*, the faculty member typically would teach two three credit hour courses (sections) per year, generate a higher than average level of research productivity, and perform an average level of service over the year.

3. Selecting a Model. The above models are intended for tenure-track faculty.

- a. *Untenured, tenure-track Assistant Professors:* Untenured, tenure-track Assistant Professors generally will follow the Balanced Model.
- b. *All tenure-track and tenured Faculty:* Tenure-track and tenured faculty members shall reach agreement with their unit head on the appropriate performance model to be applied. If a faculty member and the unit head cannot reach an agreement, the faculty member shall accept by default the Balanced Model. Normally, the model agreed upon between a faculty member and his/her unit head is expected to remain in effect until a person's career path changes. At times, however, the term of the agreement may be changed for the short-term even though the career path has not changed (e.g., to accommodate unexpected faculty turnover, to allow faculty to assume new administrative responsibilities, or to satisfy the requirements of a new research grant).

B. PROCEDURES FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE

I. TIMEFRAME FOR ASSESSING PERFORMANCE

1. General Procedure. The time line for annual performance evaluations shall be the last two fiscal years. Unless one of the exceptions below applies, the annual faculty performance review process shall cover the most recent 24 consecutive months through June 30 of the current fiscal year. Performance throughout the review period shall be weighted equally.
2. Exceptions to the General Procedure.

a. *For New Faculty Members.* Performance evaluations for new faculty members shall be phased in over a two-year period. All new faculty members shall be evaluated on their performance from the time they begin employment as a faculty member in the College through June 30 of the current year. During the two year phase-in period, such evaluations will be made by the unit head. During the second year, the faculty member will be evaluated on his/her performance over the full two-fiscal-year evaluation period.

b. *For Current Faculty Members.*

(1) Faculty members returning from a Research Leave or Development Leave. Research and development leaves are “leaves from” the activities reflected in the faculty performance models. Faculty members returning from a research leave or development leave will be evaluated with an appropriate productivity weighting scheme that reflects the type of leave, approved activities during the leave, achievements against these activities, and level of compensation (e.g., at full pay or half pay).

(2) Faculty members returning from an Approved Leave-Of-Absence (i.e., without pay) or Sabbatical. Upon returning to the College, the faculty member will, unless otherwise negotiated with the unit head and approved by the Dean, receive a salary with any adjustment that was agreed upon with the unit head and approved by the Dean immediately prior to engaging the leave-of-absence or sabbatical. In the first evaluation after the faculty member returns from the leave-of-absence or sabbatical, that faculty member’s performance will be based upon his/her productivity:

(a) since returning as an active faculty member through June 30 of the current fiscal year (pro-rated if less than 12 months), and

(b) as agreed upon with the unit head and approved by the Dean, *either*

[1] the preceding 12 consecutive months (including the leave-of-absence or sabbatical months) *or*

[2] the 12 consecutive months immediately preceding the leave-of-absence or sabbatical.

c. *For Evaluations following Periods of Two Years or More without Raise Funds Available.* If there are funds available for current permanent raises and if there were no funds available for permanent raises for the first fiscal year described in Section B.I.1. and in the year immediately preceding that year, then the evaluation period shall include:

(1) the year(s) pertinent to the current evaluation period as stated in section B.I.1, and

(2) all years immediately preceding the current evaluation period in which there were no funds available for permanent raises.

3. Annual Performance Report and Timetable. The unit head should request performance information from faculty members and receive the information no later than the end of spring semester. The information provided is to reflect the faculty member’s performance within

the appropriate evaluation timeframe. Performance information for each faculty member shall include:

- a. Faculty Annual Report (covering teaching, research, and service activities as detailed in Section A.I. of this document);
- b. The applicable performance model (See Section A.II. above); and
- c. Other supporting documentation that reflects performance.

II. DOCUMENTATION AND ITS DISTRIBUTION

The policies and procedures adopted by each unit should be consistent with this document and distributed to the respective faculty members.

III. CONFIDENTIALITY, SECURITY, AND PROFESSIONAL COURTESY

Confidentiality should be respected by all administrators and faculty members involved in the annual performance evaluation process. They should behave ethically, be aware of their legal responsibilities and conduct themselves with professional courtesy.

IV. IMPLEMENTATION DATE

This revised “Guidelines for Annual Performance Evaluation of Faculty” document shall become effective February 1, 2010.